UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.           | FILING DATE                     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/532,483                | 04/22/2005                      | John A. Organiscak   | 6395-67118-05       | 4284             |
|                           | 7590 12/02/200<br>SPARKMAN, LLP | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| 121 SW SALM               |                                 | ALEXANDER, LYLE      |                     |                  |
| SUITE 1600<br>PORTLAND, O | OR 97204                        |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                           |                                 |                      | 1797                |                  |
|                           |                                 |                      |                     |                  |
|                           |                                 |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                           |                                 |                      | 12/02/2009          | PAPER            |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.   | Applicant(s)      |  |  |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10/532,483        | ORGANISCAK ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner          | Art Unit          |  |  |
| LYLE A. ALEXANDER | 1797              |  |  |

| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears or  | n the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |
|--|--|
| THE REPLY FILED <u>23 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC  | CATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.   |
|  | s: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the th appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request   |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of this Advisory no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ON MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).   | Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In in SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  LY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorten set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL   | and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ed statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as  |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension t<br/>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>   | hereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but price (a) They raise new issues that would require further considers (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form  | ation and/or search (see NOTE below);  |
| appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corres  NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and   | ponding number of finally rejected claims.   |
| <ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. Se</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable</li> </ul>  | e attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  - e if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the   |
| non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will   |  |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided to The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 1-26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |
| was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  | cient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and   |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Noti entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcos showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and vertical transfer of the file | me <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of th REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | e status of the claims after entry is below or attached.   |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but does<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>  | NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  |
| <ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/S</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>  | SB/08) Paper No(s)   |
|  | /LYLE A ALEXANDER/   |
|  | Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797  |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The creation of new independent claims from finally rejected dependent claims would require further consideration and new grounds of rejection using the cited art of record.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Office will vacate the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejections in light of Applicants' remarks upon further appeal. The Office maintains Sharp(WO 02/063294) teaches filtration/removal of carbon dioxide from the air as taught on page 14 and acknowledged by Applicants' in their remarks. Applicants' have amended some of their claims to specifically claim the filtered contaminant. However, the claimed contaminant include carbon dioxide which is indistinguishable from Sharp. The Office agrees with Applicant that Roberts only teaches detection of tracer gases in the halogen family. Upon further appeal, claims that are directed to detection of carbon dioxide, nitrogen and oxygen as the tracer gas will define over Roberts. Finally, the Office regrets that an interview summary of the 11/10/09 interview was not sent to Applicant. It appears this was an oversight made by the Examiner. The Examiner concurs with Applicants' characterization of the interview.